



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,521	09/24/2003	Wataru Oneyama	03589/LH	4347
1933	7590	06/13/2005		EXAMINER
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 220 5TH AVE FL 16 NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			LEA EDMONDS, LISA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

78

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,521	ONEYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa Lea-Edmonds	2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 17-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/24/03, 1/31/05</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The examiner of record has considered the information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 09/24/03 and 01/31/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oross et al. (2001/0009498). With respect to claims 1-7, 9, 10, 13, 14, and 16, Oross et al. teaches an electronic device (10) comprising two cases (22, 24); a hinge unit; a cover member (20); a first engaging unit (32, 34); and a second engaging unit (28, 30) as claimed, see for example figures 1A-7B.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oross et al. (2001/0009498) as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Sasaki et al. (6262824). With respect to claims 8 and 15, Oross et al. teaches an electronic device (10) comprising two cases (22, 24); a hinge unit; a cover member (20); a first engaging unit (32, 34); and a second engaging unit (28, 30), wherein cover member (50) is transparent (see for example figures 1A-7B). However, Oross et al. lacks a teaching of a light transmit member being disposed in a portion of the case, as claimed. The apparatus of Sasaki et al. is solely relied upon for its teaching of light transmit member (43, 44) being disposed in a portion of the case, as claimed (see for example figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Sasaki et al. into the apparatus of Oross et al. to provide the user infrared communication.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 11, and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: as to claims 11 and 12, patentability resides, at least in part, in the engaging portions being rotatably engaged with each other, as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim.

8. Claims 17-20 are allowed.

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: as to claims 17-20, patentability resides, at least in part, in the electronic device comprising an electrically connecting/engaging unit which detachably engages at least one of the cases and cover member together such that the electronic units contained within the at least one case and the cover are electrically connected to one another, as claimed and in combination with the other limitations of the base claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please note the teachings of Liang et al. (5701230), André et al. (5870282), DiFonzo et al. (6262886), Ditzik (6421235), Agata et al. (6504707), and Iredale (6842338).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Lea-Edmonds whose telephone number is 571-272-2043. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Field can be reached on (571) 272-2800, ext 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lisa Lea-Edmonds
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2835

2005-06-10